

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended and the helpful assistance provide during the telephone interview conducted on October 31, 2007 between the Examiner and Applicants' undersigned representative. Comments are incorporated in the following remarks as a Statement of Summary of Interview.

Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-3, 9, 11-13, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over AAPA in view of *Murade* (US 6,297,862) and *Kim et al.* (US 5,339,181).

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over AAPA, *Murade* and *Kim et al.* as applied to claims 1-3, 9, 11-13, and 19 above, and further in view of *Yanagawa et al.* (US 6,266,117).

Summary of Amendment

Applicants have amended claims 1, 9, 11 and 19. Upon review of the claims, Applicants find that claim 22, which was added in the Amendment in RCE filed December 20, 2006, was not reproduced in the Amendment filed August 3, 2007. Accordingly, in an abundance of caution, Applicants are canceling claim 22 and adding the subject matter as new claim 23. In addition, Applicants have added new claim 24. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 9, 11-13, 19, 21, and 23-24 are pending in this application.

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-3, 9, 11-13, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over AAPA in view of *Murade* (US 6,297,862) and *Kim et al.* (US 5,339,181).

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over AAPA, *Murade* and *Kim et al.* as applied to claims 1-3, 9, 11-13, and 19 above, and further in view of *Yanagawa et al.* (US 6,266,117). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

(i) Motivation

As discussed during the telephone interview of October 31, 2007, the Final Office Action relies on AAPA as a primary reference, and because AAPA does not disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention, the Final Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art modify the LCD device of AAPA with the teachings of *Murade* (as well as *Kim et al.*) using the same rationale as prior to the earlier appeal in this application. However, in the “Decision on Appeal” dated August 25, 2006, the Board stated that “we agree with appellants that the examiner’s rationale to extend the light-shielding member in the admitted prior art device is problematic essentially for the reasons noted by the appellants.” (See paragraph beginning at page 7, line 19, of “Decision on Appeal.”) Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the next Office Action, if no Notice of Allowance issue, either (a) address the comments of the Decision on Appeal, or (b) conform to the above quoted comments of the “Decision on Appeal” as well as the subsequent comments of the “Decision on Appeal.”

(ii) Features not Taught or Suggested

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 9, 11, and 19 and respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the following reasons.

As recited in claim 1, for example, "...a first light-shielding member completely covering the switching device and extending from ends of the first metal film into the pixel area; a second light shielding member completely covering the charging device and extending from ends of the second metal film into the pixel area, wherein the first and second light shielding members each extend into the pixel area to provide a margin sufficient to block light incident on the first and second metal films; and a third light shielding member overlapping the pixel electrode at a region adjacent to the data line." As recited in claim 9, for example, "...a first dummy black matrix connected to the black matrix and extending from ends of the first metal thin film into the pixel area with a margin sufficient to block light incident on the first metal thin film; a second dummy black matrix connected to the black matrix and extending from ends of the second metal thin film into the pixel area with a margin sufficient to block light incident on the second metal thin film; and a third dummy black matrix connected to the black matrix and overlapping the pixel electrode at a region adjacent to the data line." As recited in claim 11, for example, "...forming a first light-shielding member on the first metal film to completely cover the switching device, the first light-shielding member extending from ends of the first metal film of the switching device into the pixel area to provide a margin sufficient to block the light incident on the first metal film; forming a second light shielding member on the second metal film to completely cover the charging device, the second light-shielding member extending from ends of the second metal film of the charging device into the pixel area to provide a margin sufficient to block light incident on the second metal film; and forming a third light shielding member overlapping the pixel electrode at a region adjacent to the data line." As recited in claim 19, for example,

“...forming a first dummy black matrix extending from ends of the first metal thin film into the pixel area on the front substrate with a margin sufficient to block light incident on the first metal thin film; forming a second dummy black matrix extending from ends of the second metal thin film into the pixel area on the front substrate with a margin sufficient to block light incident on the second thin film; and forming a third dummy black matrix connected to the black matrix and overlapping the pixel electrode at a region adjacent to the data line.”.

Applicants respectfully assert that none of the cited references, singly or in combination, teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 9, 11, and 19 are allowable. Further, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 2-3, 12-13, and 21 are allowable at least because of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 11, as amended, and the reasons set forth above.

New Claims 23-24

Applicants have added new claim 23 as noted above. Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claim 23 is allowable at least because of its dependency from independent claim 1, as amended, and the reasons set forth above.

Applicants have added new independent claim 24 to further define the invention. Applicants respectfully assert that new independent claim 24 is allowable at least because of the features recited therein. For example, the applied art does not disclose a second metal thin film with a width less than a separation between the one of the data lines and the adjacent one of the data lines so that the second metal thin film is separated from the one of the data lines and the

adjacent one of the data lines. Moreover, the applied art does not disclose a second light shielding member extended from the black matrix into the pixel area to completely cover the second metal thin film with a width greater than that of the second metal thin film but less than a separation between the one of the data lines and the adjacent one of the data lines so that the second light shielding member is separated from the one of the data lines and the adjacent one of the data lines.

Conclusion


In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under

37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 
Robert J. Goodell
Reg. No. 41,040

Dated: October 31, 2007

Customer No.: 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202.739.3000
Facsimile: 202.739.3001